Eur J Population (2014) 30:411–435
DOI 10.1007/s10680-014-9322-0

Family Dynamics Among Immigrants and Their Descendants in Europe: Current Research and Opportunities

Hill Kulu · Amparo González-Ferrer

Received: 19 July 2013 / Accepted: 17 June 2014 / Published online: 6 August 2014

Abstract This paper reviews recent research on family dynamics among immigrants and their descendants in Europe. While there is a large body of literature on various aspects of immigrant lives in Europe, research on family dynamics has emerged only in the last decade. Studies based on individual-level longitudinal data and disaggregated measures of partnership and fertility behaviour have significantly advanced our understanding of the factors shaping family patterns among immigrants and their descendants and have contributed to research on immigrant integration. By drawing on recent research, this paper proposes several ways of further developing research on ethnic minority families. We emphasise the need to study family changes among immigrants and their descendants over their life courses, investigate various modes of family behaviour and conduct more truly comparative research to deepen our understanding of how ethnic minorities structure their family lives in different institutional and policy settings.

Keywords Marriage · Cohabitation · Divorce · Separation · Fertility · Immigrants · Ethnic minorities · Second generation · Europe

H. Kulu (✉)
School of Environmental Sciences, University of Liverpool, Roxby Building, Liverpool L69 7ZT, UK
e-mail: hill.kulu@liverpool.ac.uk

A. González-Ferrer
Institute of Economy, Geography and Demography (IEGD), Center for Humanities and Social Sciences (CCHS), Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), Albasanz, 26-28, 28037 Madrid, Spain
e-mail: amparo.gonzalez@cchs.csic.es

1 Introduction

In recent decades, European countries have witnessed increasing immigration streams and ethnic heterogeneity of their populations (Castles and Miller 2009). The improvement of social cohesion and the effect of immigration on social, cultural and demographic trends have become major issues in European countries and significant topics of research among social scientists. There is a large body of literature investigating various aspects of immigrant lives in Europe: their legal status and citizenship (e.g., Seifert 1997; Bauböck 2003; Howard 2005), employment and education (Adsera and Chiswick 2007; Kogan 2007; Rendall et al. 2010; Rebhun 2010), health and mortality (Bos et al. 2007; Sole-Auro and Crimmins 2008; Wengler 2011; Hannemann 2012), residential and housing patterns (Kulu and Tammaru 2003; Musterd 2005; Arbaci 2008; Finney and Catney 2012), and linguistic, cultural and religious diversity (Kulu and Tammaru 2004; Foner and Alba 2008; Gungor et al. 2011). While family dynamics and patterns among immigrants and ethnic minorities were under-researched topics for many years, recently there has been a growing interest in the study of families of immigrants and their descendants (Andersson 2004; González-Ferrer 2006a, b; Bernhardt et al. 2007a, b; Milewski 2010; Holland and de Valk 2013). The diversity of family forms has increased among immigrants and ethnic minorities as it has among native populations; this compounds the difficulties of establishing a single and uni-directional relationship between immigrant family dynamics and integration. Nevertheless, most recent research illustrates that immigrants' family trajectories provide valuable information not only on immigrant experiences and their integration but also on the wider societal trends in European countries.

The aim of this paper is firstly to review recent research on immigrant and ethnic minority families in Europe and secondly to discuss new research opportunities in the area. We will first provide an overview of recent studies on union formation among immigrants and their descendants with a special focus on mixed marriages, their spread and stability over time. Next, we will review studies on childbearing among immigrants and their descendants. We will finally discuss how current research on families of migrants and their descendants in Europe can be further developed to improve our understanding of factors promoting (or hindering) integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities. We will emphasise the need to study family changes among immigrants and their descendants over their life courses and from a comparative perspective.

Our review is based on research articles on partnership dynamics and childbearing among immigrants and their descendants that have been published in the main international journals of demography, population and migration studies between 2000 and 2013.[1] We will focus solely on research in Europe and will use studies from elsewhere (mostly from the U.S.) to discuss the context of research on migrant and ethnic minority family and fertility. No list of articles is complete,

[1] The following journals were included: *Demography; European Journal of Population; Demographic Research; Population Studies; Population, Space and Place; Population; International Migration Review; Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies; Journal of Marriage and the Family; Advances in Life Course Research; European Sociological Review*.

neither is ours; further every such a list involves subjective choices driven by the authors' preferences and knowledge. Most importantly, however, we are reassured that we will cover main streams in research on migrant family and fertility and have included important contributions into our review.

2 Particularities of Research on Immigrant and Ethnic Minority Families

The ultimate aim of research on immigrants and ethnic minorities is to gain a better understanding of the factors that promote or hinder their successful integration into a new social environment and provide evidence-based policy recommendations to support their well-being and, thus, social cohesion. Social science research has developed various concepts and indicators to measure adaptation of immigrants. Although several competing approaches have been proposed in the literature (Gordon 1964; Berry 1992; Portes and Zhou 1993; Alba and Nee 1997), the outcomes of immigrant adaptation can ultimately be placed on an axis running from 'assimilation' and 'integration' on one pole to 'separation' and 'marginalisation' on the other. While conventional and mostly economic research in the U.S. has considered assimilation of immigrants to be the expected and desired outcome, recent literature favours speaking about immigrant integration, intercultural co-existence or even diversity. It is desirable that immigrants and ethnic minorities achieve a high level of structural assimilation or integration, i.e., they should have the same educational, employment, and residential opportunities and outcomes as natives, but they may simultaneously display some cultural distinctiveness, e.g., practise their own religion or (also) speak their own languages (at home). The structural and cultural dimensions of adaptation are often interrelated, but such a distinction can be made for analytical purposes. Moreover, the recent literature on transnationalism has challen ged the relevance of the classical assimilation versus marginalisation debate, arguing that some immigrants and their descendants wish to live 'in-between' old and new home countries ('here-and-there') and that this practice should be promoted by the governments of (nation) states (Vertovec 2004; Glick Schiller 2009). The attention paid to transnational family arrangements has substantially increased in the last decade, and an important question is whether living 'bifocal lives' or in 'transnational space' reflects successful integration in our globalised world, or rather an increased marginalisation in a world where nation states still play an important role. However, the lack of adequate longitudinal data in both origin and destination countries has seriously limited the possibility to properly test these ideas, as Baizán et al. (2014) have recently shown.

The literature usually considers two types of factors that shape the outcomes of immigrant adaptation. On the one hand, there are individual preferences and desires, and on the other hand, opportunities offered by the societal context (Alba and Nee 1997; Kalmijn 1998). Immigrants may have a strong desire to integrate, but the lack of opportunities may lead to their marginalisation rather than their integration. Meso-level factors are also considered along with micro and macro-level determinants, including the role of 'significant others', usually the immigrant group, the family and peers, and the residential and housing concentration or

segregation of immigrants (Musterd 2005; Bernhardt et al. 2007b). The discussion of the causes of immigrant integration can thus be seen as a part of the wider social science debate on the role of 'agency versus structure' in shaping individual action and social phenomena (Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1984). The role of 'economy versus culture' in immigrant integration is an another important dimension. This is sometimes seen as a part of the 'agency versus structure' debate, although this is not necessarily the case. While (cultural) preferences and desires can drive immigrant behaviour, the preferences themselves may have been shaped by the majority or minority culture, or the dominant normative environment may discourage or encourage achieving specific (cultural) desires. Recent research has increasingly paid attention to the interactions between both types of factors, although we are still far from a proper integrative model.

In addition to the distinction between preferences and structural constraints and that of culture and economy, the need to distinguish and separate the analyses of the family-building process across generational lines has also been emphasised (de Valk and Milewski 2011). International migration is an important life event and brings with it changes in living environment—it shapes the experiences of the 'first generation'; in contrast, migration as such is not an issue for the members of the so-called 'second generation' because they never moved from one country to another. Further, among the first generation, family formation is largely completed by the time of migration for those who move at a late adult age, while still in progress for those who move at younger ages. Therefore, the timing and characteristics of the family-building process are likely to differ in important ways across immigrant generations and for the first generation based on age at migration.

3 Formation and Dissolution of Marriages

3.1 Partner Choice: Exogamous Versus Endogamous Couples

For a long time, a basic distinction was made between endogamous and exogamous marriages. There is a widespread consensus around the idea that exogamous marriages, also called mixed or bi-national marriages, are the type of marital choice that promote integration.[2] Studies systematically reveal that family is the sphere

[2] Bi-national marriages are commonly defined as marriages between individuals that hold different nationalities in their passports. The most common situation refers to a couple in which one spouse is a citizen of the country of residence and the other is not. However, the term is also used for marriages where one spouse is born in the country of residence and the other was born abroad, regardless of their current nationalities. In contrast, the term mixed marriage is commonly utilized to refer to bi-cultural marriages, regardless of the spouses' nationality and country of birth. Bi-national couples are not necessarily bi-cultural, and some of the couples who do not appear in the statistics on bi-national relationships (because both partners are of the same nationality or even born in the same country) are of course bicultural. Ideally, these two types of marriages should be distinguished because nationality and ethnic origin often do not overlap in migration contexts. However, a detailed look at statistical realities illustrates how complex it is to count and separate one from each other, and especially to run cross-national comparisons when national statistical systems utilize different classification criteria. For this reason, and accordingly with the cross-national approach of our review, in this article we will include studies that utilised both definitions.

where individuals (both immigrants and natives) seek less inter-ethnic relationships and, accordingly, bi-national couples are seen as the ultimate litmus test of immigrant assimilation and integration (Kalmijn 1998; Song 2010). Some studies conclude that there is a positive correlation between inter-ethnic marriage and economic assimilation among immigrants (Baker and Benjamin 1997; Meng and Gregory 2005), and also that children of mixed couples are indistinguishable from native-born children in their educational performance. In contrast, endogamous marriages are likely to entail greater difficulties for the integration of family members into the wider relationship system of the receiving society because they offer a "safer" context for interactions, which renders contacts with the outside group less necessary, and because they are also subjected to stronger social control from their peers.

Research on partner choice shows that people wish to marry someone similar to themselves in terms of education, values, religion and culture (Kalmijn 1998). This supports the idea that immigrant-native marriages spread only when immigrants and their descendants have gone through successful structural and cultural integration in the above-mentioned characteristics, which may take generations, as suggested by historical studies on European immigrants in the U.S. (Logan and Shin 2012). At the same time, however, there are always individuals, both among natives and immigrants, who marry across the boundaries of social groups and thus promote social change and immigrant integration. In fact, studies that examine the evolution of the intermarriage rate over a relatively long period of time tend to find a U-shaped pattern that is explained by the forces of the marriage market in the first phase of the immigration process (scarcity of co-ethnic available partners along with the intense selection at work in the origin of the immigration flows) and the increasing cultural convergence and integration later on (see Kane and Stephen 1988; Klein 2001 for the German post-war experience, among others).

In his review essay, Kalmijn (1998) discussed three factors that shape individual partner choice. The first is the *preferences* of individuals for certain characteristics in a spouse. When an individual considers a set of potential partners, they are evaluated on the basis of the resources they can offer; the most important resources to consider and assess are socio-economic resources, including social status and education and cultural characteristics, which usually refer to the preference to marry someone who is culturally similar. The endogamy is thus seen as an unintended consequence of individual preferences for resources related to a partner (Kalmijn 1998). The second factor is the influence of the *social group* of which individuals are members. All individuals are members of groups and socialised into the values and norms of those groups. The usual expectation is that individuals marry someone from their own group or from a group similar to theirs. Marriage across group lines or with someone from a distant group is discouraged by various sanctions that groups, families or peers can impose on individuals. The final factor is the constraints of the *marriage market* (Kalmijn 1998). It is obvious that the chances for endogamy are larger if the group is large and sex ratios within the own group are well balanced; geographical location and concentration are also important. Some small minority groups may have high endogamy rates because of high spatial concentration.

A large body of literature has examined immigrant-native and inter-ethnic marriages in the U.S. (Alba and Golden 1986; Pagnini and Morgan 1990; Lichter et al. 2011). Research has also investigated ethnically mixed marriages in selected European countries (Bagley 1972; Berrington 1994; Coleman 1994; Voas 1998); however, studies using longitudinal data and multivariate models have emerged only in the last decade or so. Most of these studies have examined the role of some of the above-discussed factors in explaining intermarriage in one or another particular context. González-Ferrer (2006b) studied partner choice among post-war immigrants and their descendants in Germany. The analysis showed that immigrants with a high educational level were more likely to marry a native-born individual than those with a low educational level. The exogamy rate increased with a decrease in the group size and with unbalanced sex-ratios within the group. A study of the Netherlands by Kalmijn and van Tubergen (2006) largely supported previous findings. The analysis of ethnic intermarriage among Surinamese, Dutch Antilleans, Turks and Moroccans showed that ethnic exogamy was more frequent among those who were higher educated, arrived at a younger age or were born in the Netherlands. The study also found that the native-migrant intermarriage was more frequent when the group-specific sex ratio was uneven. A subsequent study by van Tubergen and Maas (2007) added support for the idea that the sex ratio and the size of an immigrant group are important determinants of intermarriage along with individual education and language skills.

Similar results were found by Safi and Rogers (2008) and Hamel et al. (2013) in France; the analysis showed increasing probability of mixed marriage for both men and women with increasing educational levels, fluency in French at the time of arrival in France, and with scarcity of co-ethnics of the opposite sex in their region of residence. In line with the latter results, in their census-based study of majority-minority unions in Estonia, van Ham and Tammaru (2011) reported that employment in white-collar occupations increased the likelihood of being in a mixed union among minority women. However, the effect was opposite among women belonging to the majority population. The importance of opportunity structures was also emphasised by Muttarak and Heath (2010) in their study on intermarriage in Britain, in which individuals in more diverse residential areas were shown to have a higher likelihood of forming exogamous marriages, thus supporting the idea that residential segregation may hinder intermarriage. Along the same lines, Schroedter and Rössel (2013) showed that living in a Swiss canton with fewer Swiss persons and living in border regions clearly increased the propensity of Swiss people to form a marriage with an EU15 citizen born abroad. Similar results were obtained by Haandrikman (2014) in Sweden. A number of other studies have supported the importance of above-discussed individual and contextual factors in shaping the patterns of intermarriage in various contexts, Lievens (1998) in Belgium; Cortina et al. (2008) in Spain and Safi and Rogers (2008) in France.

It seems important to highlight, however, that the effect of many explanatory factors, often including the structural constraints imposed by the marriage markets, is gendered. In fact, the determinants of partner choices seem to be strongly gendered, especially when people of immigrant origin are involved. As noted by Lanzieri (2012), for a large majority of European countries a higher percentage of

foreign-born women are in mixed marriages than foreign-born men. For native groups, the reverse applies. Research on Britain shows that the patterns vary across ethnic groups; Black men are more likely to intermarry with white women than black women with white men, while Asian men are less likely than women to intermarry (Feng et al. 2010). Gender differences in this regard are not restricted to the incidence of intermarriage, but also to the explanatory factors underlying this type of marital choice. Unbalanced sex ratios seem to matter more for men than for women in shaping their partner choices, both for native and immigrant partners (Schroedter and Rössel 2013; González-Ferrer 2006b). Hamel et al. (2013) also concluded that the probability of forming a mixed couple for those who were not in couple at the time of arrival increased with the length of residence in France for immigrant women, while it decreased with the length of residence for men.

Finally, the country of origin-mix seems to be crucial in explaining different rates and dynamics of intermarriage between the majority population and minorities of immigrant origins in different European countries, which is likely to be at least partly related to the importance of cultural factors in partner choices. Dribe and Lundh (2011) investigated this issue using Swedish register data, and showed that immigrants from countries culturally distant to Sweden with regards to values, religion or language were less likely to intermarry with natives than were immigrants from culturally more proximate countries. Lucassen and Laarman (2009) examined the role of religion in intermarriage among post-war migrants to five European countries: Germany, France, England, Belgium and the Netherlands. The analysis revealed that migrants whose faith had no tradition in Western Europe had much lower intermarriage rates than those whose religious backgrounds corresponded with those common in the country of destination. A set of recent articles on exogamous marriages in different EU countries has illustrated that bi-national couples are not a homogenous group even if we restrict our study to couples where partners come from different European countries. The geography, migrant history and patterns, as well as cultural and linguistic similarities, display a strong relevance for partner choice in a unified Europe (de Valk and Medrano 2014).

While many studies show that the descendants of immigrants have higher intermarriage rates than migrants (González-Ferrer 2006b; Muttarak and Heath 2010; Safi 2010; Hamel and Pailhé 2011), recently a series of studies have emerged focusing explicitly on the spread and determinants of mixed marriages among the second generation, a growing population subgroup in European societies. Huschek et al. (2012) investigated partner choice among the descendants of Turkish immigrants in seven European countries. Their analysis showed that the descendants of immigrants who chose a second-generation partner were in-between the partner choice of a first generation and native partner in terms of their family values and contacts to non-co-ethnic peers. A second generation partner was the most popular choice in Germany, supporting the importance of the group size and structure in partner choice. In contrast, a similar study by Hartung et al. (2011) on the intermarriage of young people of Turkish and Moroccan ethnic origin in Belgium revealed that a large part of the second generation lived with a first-generation co-ethnic partner. Further, most Belgian-born partners were the descendants of immigrants with the same ethnic background, which means endogamous couples.

These studies indicate that marriage patterns of the descendants of immigrants are more complex than previous studies suggest, with intra-group marriages being more common than initially expected as a result of the practice of bringing partners from their parents' country of origin, especially among men (González-Ferrer 2006b; Milewski and Hamel 2010). Marriage to a co-ethnic residing in the host country ('marriage of immigrants') and marriage to someone from the country of origin residing in the country of destination ('marriage migrants') are both, in principle, endogamous marriages.[3] Therefore, one could assume that these two marital choices would make no difference with regard to their potential impact on the immigrants' prospects for integration. However, there may be some differences between these two variants of endogamous marriage that may be relevant in this respect. First, in couples made up of two co-national immigrants, both partners would have similar knowledge about the host country, its language and its customs by the time they meet. In addition, their decisions to migrate were made independently of each other and, therefore, they are likely to have benefited equally from the intense selection process involved in migration. In contrast, in couples where one immigrant migrated first and the other partner only left their country of origin for the purpose or as a result of marriage and family formation, the former (the first mover partner) will have a better knowledge of the receiving society, which may obviously affect the power balance within the couple and perhaps also the integration prospects not only of the marriage migrant partner but also of their children and the entire family.

In fact, the least educated Turkish men are found to be the most likely to bring their spouse from the country of origin, households formed by marriage migration are more likely to be multigenerational (González-Ferrer 2006b), and the fertility of marriage migrant women tends to be higher than that of others (see Sect. 4). Moreover, female marriage migrants have been found to be less likely to work than strictly reunified wives in Germany (González-Ferrer 2006a) and for some ethnic groups in Spain (González-Ferrer 2011). Thus, it seems clear that the potential integration impact of these two types of endogamous couples is likely to substantially differ, at least among first generation migrants. This all does not suggest that the 'marriage of immigrants' should be promoted over the 'marriage migration' by the governments; it rather provides another example of how different reasons for immigration may shape individual lives in the destination country.[4] In fact, a recent cross-national study on the spousal choice of descendants of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants has shown how that the stronger preference for transnational spouses among higher educated compared to lower educated women remains after controlling for religiosity, which suggests their choice might be related to the lack of appropriately educated partners in the country of residence (Carol et al. 2014). Additionally, some evidence suggests that transnational

[3] We say "in principle" because nationality and ethnic origin do not necessarily coincide in the migration context. A marriage between two Turkish nationals in Germany might not be an endogamous marriage if, for instance, one of the partners is Kurd and the other is not. However, these qualifications are commonly omitted.

[4] We thank one of the referees who drew our attention to the importance of the distinction between the 'marriage of immigrants' and the 'marriage migration' and its implications.

marriages have recently declined among some ethnic minority groups (van Kerckem et al. 2013).

3.2 Dissolution of Marriages

While the spread of native-immigrant intermarriage is an important indicator of changing social boundaries between the groups and immigrant integration, it is equally important to study the stability and fate of mixed marriages to gain a deeper understanding of the role mixed partnerships play in the integration of immigrants and their descendants. Studies on marital divorce show that dissimilarity between the partners increases the risk of divorce: the risk is high when there is a large age gap between the partners, or when they have different educational levels or religious backgrounds (Landis 1949; Burchinal and Chancellor 1963; Bumpass and Sweet 1972; Becker et al. 1977; Tzeng 1992). If dissimilarity between the partners increases the risk of divorce then native-immigrant marriages may have a higher divorce risk than those between two natives or between immigrants.

The *exogamy hypothesis* states that mixed marriages between natives and immigrants have a higher likelihood of separation than intra-group marriages for respective groups. This is due to the following factors (Milewski and Kulu 2014). First, natives and immigrants come from different socialisation environments and usually belong to different ethnic groups. Therefore, it is likely that their preferences, values, and norms also differ. Dissimilarity in preferences, values, and norms reduces the time spent on joint activities, increases misunderstandings between the partners and is a constant source of conflict (Kalmijn et al. 2005; Zhang and van Hook 2009). Second, exogamous marriages receive less support from the social networks of the respective spouses than endogamous unions. Marrying outside the ethnic or cultural group means crossing a social boundary; this may be tolerated, but is usually not welcomed and/or supported by the members of the respective groups. As a result, the couple may feel neglected by their 'significant others' and this may put a strain on their relationship. They may also lack support during the difficult times that each partnership faces from time to time. Third, mixed marriages have a higher likelihood of experiencing open discrimination in their daily lives; they may be confronted with disdain by the general public as expressed in occasional verbal abuse by strangers or other such activities. Previous studies have shown that such experiences are not uncommon for couples of mixed marriages, particularly for those in which the spouses come from different racial groups (Zhang and van Hook 2009). Exogamous couples' constantly negative experiences may increase marital instability and lead to divorce (Milewski and Kulu 2014).

The exogamy hypothesis has been supported by several studies on intermarriage in European countries. Kalmijn et al. (2005) investigated native-immigrant intermarriage in the Netherlands. The analysis of marriages formed between 1974 and 1984 showed that partnerships between Dutch and other nationalities had a higher risk of divorce than endogamous marriages. A subsequent Dutch study by Smith et al. (2012) on register data from 1995 to 2008 supported previous findings. Milewski and Kulu (2014) examined the effect of native-immigrant intermarriage

on divorce in the German context. The analysis showed that marriages between German-born individuals and immigrants had a higher likelihood of separation than marriages between two German-born individuals or between immigrants from the same country. Dribe and Lundh (2012) reached similar conclusions in their study on exogamy and union dissolution in Sweden and Eeckhaut et al. (2011) in their research on intermarriage and divorce in Belgium. Mixed marriages faced higher dissolution risks than endogamous marriages. Based on the analysis of female birth cohorts 1924–1973, Katus et al. (2002a) reported similar findings for native-immigrant unions in Estonia.

While all these studies showed that exogamous marriages had higher divorce levels than endogamous marriages, further analysis revealed that the divorce risk increased with an increase in the cultural dissimilarity between the spouses; marriages where spouses came from distant cultures had a higher divorce risk than those unions where partners originated from similar cultures. The studies thus also supported the *cultural dissimilarity hypothesis*—an extension of the exogamy hypothesis. The reasons for an elevated risk are similar to the exogamy hypothesis (Milewski and Kulu 2014). First, dissimilarity in values and norms is expected to be greater for spouses from distant cultures than for partners who have similar cultural backgrounds. This makes the former marriages more prone to conflicts and more fragile than the latter ones. Second, it is expected that marriages where cultural dissimilarity between the partners is large receive less support from the spouses' respective social networks than marriages with culturally similar spouses. Third, marriages with culturally dissimilar spouses are also more likely to experience discrimination in society.

Cultural dissimilarity may be an important reason for elevated divorce risks for native-immigrants marriages, but there may also be other reasons (Milewski and Kulu 2014). First, couples in mixed marriages may differ from spouses in endogamous unions by their demographic or socio-economic characteristics; they may have married at younger ages; there may be more people from specific social strata among them, e.g., unemployed individuals or people with high income—all these factors are associated with elevated divorce levels. Second, it is likely that individuals who intermarry have more liberal values and may thus be less committed to the norms of their respective groups (Bumpass and Sweet 1972). Third, the partner selection itself may have resulted in marriages with further dissimilarity between the spouses, which potentially increases marital instability; e.g., there may be a large age gap between the spouses in mixed marriages or the partners may have different educational levels. Therefore, if we were able to control for all important traits of spouses in mixed marriages, native-immigrant marriages should not necessarily be more likely to end in divorce than intra-group marriages for natives and immigrants.

Most studies in Europe have provided some support for the *selectivity hypothesis*; once the characteristics of spouses and marriages are controlled for, the exogamy effect significantly decreases; however, exogamous marriages still exhibit a significantly higher likelihood of separation than endogamous marriages (Kalmijn et al. 2005; Andersson and Scott 2010; Dribe and Lundh 2012; Smith et al. 2012; Milewski and Kulu 2014). Interestingly, Feng et al. (2012) reached somewhat

different conclusions in their study on mixed-ethnic marriages in Britain. Their large-scale longitudinal study showed that mixed-ethnic unions had a higher risk of dissolution than co-ethnic unions, as expected. However, after controlling for partners' characteristics, most importantly the younger ages of people in mixed unions, the risk of divorce for mixed-ethnic unions was no longer higher than that for two constituent co-ethnic unions.

There is thus a growing literature on the formation and dissolution of exogamous marriages in Europe aiming at deepening our understanding of the factors influencing the spread and stability of mixed marriages and their role in immigrant integration. Before we proceed with a discussion of the current research and outline opportunities for the future we will review research on fertility among immigrants and their descendants, another important research stream on family dynamics among immigrant and ethnic minorities in Europe.

4 Fertility Among Immigrants and Their Descendants

4.1 Immigrant Fertility

There is a growing interest in fertility dynamics and patterns among immigrants and their descendants in Europe. While research on immigrant fertility in Europe is not new (Schoorl 1990; Dinkel and Lebok 1997), studies using individual-level longitudinal data have emerged only in the last decade. The new data and approaches have allowed researchers to disaggregate fertility patterns and closely investigate the relationship between migration and fertility. The aim of research on immigrant fertility has been to understand fertility patterns after immigration and whether and how immigration influences fertility levels. Previous research on migrant fertility has proposed four competing views on an individual's fertility behaviour following a move from one country to another (Hervitz 1985; Singley and Landale 1998; Andersson 2004; Andersson and Scott 2005; Kulu 2005, 2006; Milewski 2007).

The *socialisation hypothesis* relies on the assumption that the fertility behaviour of migrants reflects the fertility preferences and behaviour dominant in their childhood. Therefore, people who move from one social environment to another exhibit fertility levels similar to non-migrants at their origin, and convergence towards fertility levels of the destination population occurs only in the next generation (given that differences between places do exist). The socialisation hypothesis thus assumes that an individual's fertility preferences and behaviour are relatively stable over the life course. The *adaptation hypothesis*, by contrast, assumes that an individual's current social context rather than the childhood environment is what matters most. Further, it emphasises the importance of both socio-cultural and economic factors. Dominant values and norms concerning the family, childbearing and gender roles shape an individual's fertility preferences and behaviour. Similarly, current economic opportunities and constraints will promote or hinder an individual's childbearing behaviour (Singley and Landale 1998; Kulu 2006; Milewski 2007).

The *selection hypothesis* also assumes that people who move from one social environment to another show fertility levels similar to those of population at the destination. This is not due to a change in their fertility behaviour, however, but rather to the fact that migrants are a select group whose fertility preferences are different from those of the population at origin and more similar to the people at destination. This selectivity may occur on the basis of individual characteristics such as education, occupation, social mobility or career ambitions, family proneness or other characteristics that shape and reflect an individual's long-term plans (Macisco et al. 1970; Hoem 1975). Recent research on migrant fertility has extended the conventional notion of selection by showing how migrations driven by marriage lead to elevated fertility levels immediately after migration (Singley and Landale 1998; Andersson 2004; Kulu 2005). The selection may thus also occur on the basis of an individual's or couple's life stage and related intentions. Finally, the *disruption hypothesis* suggests that migrants show particularly low levels of fertility immediately following migration. This is because migration brings with it economic costs and psychological stress associated with the process of moving or the change in environment. In addition, couples may intentionally delay childbearing until the move has been completed and some adjustment to the new place is made. The drop in fertility should be temporary and the pace of fertility should gradually return to its usual pattern (Singley and Landale 1998; Kulu 2006; Milewski 2007). The disruption is thus expected to influences the tempo rather than the quantum of fertility (Wilson 2013).

Most recent research on immigrant fertility in Europe has aimed at testing one or several hypotheses on migrant fertility. In a seminal paper, Andersson (2004) examined childbearing patterns among immigrants in Sweden using longitudinal register data. The analysis showed elevated first-birth levels for migrants during the first few years after immigration to Sweden; second and third-birth rates were also relatively high after migration. The results of the study led the author to conclude that international migration, marriage and the start of childbearing are often closely connected events; this is why elevated rather than depressed fertility levels are observed for migrant women. The fertility levels of immigrants who had lived in Sweden for a period of at least 5 years were similar to the levels of the Swedish-born population, thus supporting also the idea of rapid adaptation of immigrant fertility behaviour to that of the population at destination. Milewski (2007) arrived at very similar conclusions in her study on the fertility of immigrants in Germany. Using individual-level panel data, the author showed that immigrant women had significantly higher first-birth rates than German-born women; immigrant fertility was elevated shortly after arrival in Germany. The fertility differences between native Germans and immigrants decreased after controlling for marital status and duration, but they remained significant. The study thus supported the idea that international migration and family formation are often *interrelated events*; it also suggested that having a child immediately after migration (and marriage) might reflect poor employment prospectives of marriage migrants and their desire to strengthen their position in a traditional family setting (Kulu and Milewski 2007).

Several recent studies from other countries that use individual-level longitudinal data have shown elevated fertility levels for migrants after moving to a new country.

Castro Martin and Rosero-Bixby (2011) examined childbearing patterns of immigrants in Spain and showed that immigrant women from North Africa had a peak of high fertility shortly after arrival in Spain, particularly if they moved for family reasons or if they were married before migration. Interestingly, the study also revealed that women who moved for work purposes and those who already had children in the country of origin had significantly lower fertility levels during their first years in Spain in comparison to other immigrant women. A study by Mussino and Strozza (2012a) on immigrant fertility in Italy supported the idea that marriage migrants and employment-related migrants may have different fertility patterns after migration. The analysis showed that women who moved for family reasons had elevated fertility levels after migration to Italy, whereas those who moved for employment-related reason had lower fertility levels after arrival; the pattern persisted when age at entry and duration since immigration were controlled.

While first-birth patterns are thus largely shaped by the reason for migration (marriage versus work), studies have proceeded to investigate second and third-birth levels to determine whether and how factors related to origin and destination countries influence immigrants' childbearing patterns and to measure their integration levels. Is immigrant total fertility high (Sobotka 2008) because of the composition of the immigrant group—the population at risk to calculate the total fertility may consist mostly of married women with short marriage durations (Toulemon 2004)—, or do socialisation factors also play a role? Andersson and Scott (2007) examined second- and third-birth rates for immigrant women in Sweden. The analysis showed a similar positive effect of labour market attachment (employment) on second- and third-birth rates for native Swedes and immigrants, which the authors attributed to the equalising effects of the Swedish welfare state and successful immigrant integration (see also Lundström and Andersson (2012) on similar effects on first-birth rates). However, the analysis also revealed that immigrants from high fertility countries (Somalia, Turkey and Vietnam) had significantly higher second- and third-birth levels than Swedish-born women, thus providing evidence for socialisation effects along with adaptation processes.

Similarly, Milewski (2010) showed that second and particularly third-birth levels were relatively high for immigrant women from Turkey even after controlling for socio-economic factors, which the author attributed to socialisation factors. Mussino and Strozza (2012b) arrived at a similar conclusion; the analysis of second-birth rates among immigrants in Italy showed that immigrants from North Africa (Morocco), particularly those who were in endogamous marriages, had significantly higher fertility levels than those who came from Eastern European countries (Albania and Romania). The importance of socialisation factors does not necessarily suggest high fertility levels for immigrants. Klesment (2010) provided support for the socialisation hypothesis in his study on second births in Estonia; lower second-birth rates among immigrant women reflected the dominant patterns in Russia where most immigrants to Estonia originate from. The differences between native and immigrant populations extended to the educational gradient in the second-birth rates. Similarly, Okun and Kagya (2012) reported relatively low fertility for immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Israel; however, the authors attributed

low immigrant fertility to the economic uncertainty and hardship experienced after migration rather than to the factors related to socialisation.

4.2 Childbearing Patterns Among the Descendants of Immigrants

While the 'forces' of the origin and destination countries interact to shape immigrants' childbearing patterns, the fertility behaviour of the second generation is mostly subject to influences from the country of destination. Nevertheless, growing up in a 'destination country', but within a family of immigrants, suggests that the factors of origin, particularly those related to culture and language, are present and important. The fertility behaviour of the descendants of immigrants is considered to be a good indicator of their cultural integration, with the assumption of no (or little) differences between them and the native population if the integration levels were high (Garssen and Nicolaas 2008; Scott and Stanfors 2011). It is possible that the second generation grows mostly up under the influences of the mainstream society and is thus socialised into or adapts to the values, norms and behaviour of the native population (note that the factors of socialisation and adaptation are difficult to distinguish here). Alternatively, they may mostly grow up under the influences of immigrant or minority subculture, which may also be reflected in their family and fertility ideals and behaviour (Katus et al. 2002b; Bernhardt et al. 2007a; de Valk and Liefbroer 2007; Goldscheider et al. 2011; Milewski 2010).

Previous research has shown that while the descendants of some immigrants have fertility levels and patterns similar to those of the native population, there are also ethnic minorities, mostly of non-Western origin, with relatively early childbearing and high fertility levels (Sobotka 2008; Coleman and Dubuc 2010). Milewski (2010) investigated childbearing patterns of the descendants of immigrants in Germany. The analysis showed that there were few differences in fertility behaviour between native Germans and the descendants of immigrants from Southern European countries, whereas the descendants of migrants from Turkey showed distinct fertility patterns: they had their first child much earlier than native Germans and the likelihood of having a child and having three children was much higher in comparison to the native population. Scott and Stanfors (2011) arrived at similar results in their study on the fertility of the second generation in Sweden. Their analysis showed that the descendants of immigrants from high fertility countries (Turkey, Lebanon and Syria) had significantly higher first-birth rates than native Swedes or the descendants of immigrants from other European countries. The analysis also revealed that in most cases, fertility levels were lower among the second generation than for those who arrived in Sweden as children, supporting the idea that integration has been more comprehensive for the second generation than for the 1.5 generation.

Milewski (2011) compared first-birth rates of the descendants of migrants from Turkey in seven European countries. While the second generation women of Turkish origin had relatively high first-birth levels in all seven countries, there were significant differences across countries: the descendants of Turkish immigrants had somewhat lower first-birth rates in Germany and Switzerland than in Sweden, France and the Netherlands, reflecting the existing fertility differences between

European countries. The author concluded that the study provided evidence for both a socialisation into a 'Turkish subculture' and an adaptation to the mainstream society. While the findings could also be interpreted to support the segmented assimilation theory, the author emphasised the importance of the welfare state in shaping fertility behaviour. Garssen and Nicolaas (2008) studied fertility of women of Turkish and Moroccan origin in the Netherlands and concluded that immigrants had significantly higher completed fertility than native Dutch, whereas women of the second generation resembled native Dutch women much more than their mothers. Interestingly, however, a closer look at the results revealed that the descendants of immigrants held a clear middle position between immigrants and native Dutch in their fertility behaviour; this was so for their level of childlessness and for the pace towards completed fertility. All recent studies thus show that fertility levels for the descendants of immigrants are usually lower than those for immigrants, but for some non-Western groups, fertility levels are relatively high in comparison to the native population; the reasons for their high fertility are less clear, although most studies attribute this to incomplete cultural assimilation of the second generation.

5 Challenges and Opportunities

We have reviewed the two current research streams on migrant families in Europe: the formation and dissolution of couples and fertility dynamics among immigrants and their descendants. Drawing upon individual-level longitudinal data and disaggregated measures of partnership and fertility behaviour, recent research has significantly advanced our understanding of the determinants of family dynamics among ethnic minorities and also contributed to research on immigrant integration in European countries. We think that there are at least four ways of further developing research on immigrants and ethnic minorities. This list is not exhaustive, rather we will emphasise aspects which we consider important and which have been neglected so far, and which, we believe, can be studied with data and methods at hand.

First, we need to study family changes among immigrants and their descendants *over their life courses* (or a significant part of them). While life course research has a long tradition in social science research (Elder 1994), studies on immigrants and their descendants have analysed only one transition at a time. We argue that it is critical to go beyond the 'one life-event-at-a-time' approach and to simultaneously study several transitions (and the sequence of various transitions if applicable); this is the way of gaining a 'holistic' picture of the family lives of immigrants and their descendants (see also de Valk et al. 2011). For example, assume a young man born in country A will move to country B at age 20. Assume that he will first cohabit with a woman born in country B; this partnership will last a year. Next he will cohabit and then marry a woman from country A. This example indicates that an immigrant may thus experience more than one partnership and each with an individual with different backgrounds (e.g., the first partnership with a native-born individual; the second relationship with another immigrant). Clearly, the study of partnership

dynamics over the life course of an immigrant provides us with much richer information about opportunities and constraints the migrant faces than any analysis of only one (or the first) marriage of the migrant. Some of the reviewed studies suggested the importance of the family life course in explaining events at a later age. For instance, mixed marriages were significantly more likely among second unions of female immigrants living in France than among those facing their first marriage, while the same effect was absent for immigrant men (Hamel et al. 2013). However, a systematic study of the most dynamic dimension of family formation processes among immigrants is still lacking.

A closely related topic is the study of the timing of union formation in the life course and its implications for mixed marriages. In a recent study, Soehl and Yahirun (2011) showed that the tendency of people of Turkish origin in Germany to marry early and native Germans to marry late has created a 'temporal separation' in the marriage market, which may have also influenced the spread (and stability) of mixed marriages. Mixed marriages between native Germans and the minority group tends to happen at later ages; at first glance this seems to support that the most integrated (or assimilated) individuals marry (later and) native Germans; interestingly, however, it is equally possible that individuals with a minority background who fail to find a suitable partner from their own group have to marry natives (if they wish to marry at all) as very few potential partners from the minority group are available after certain ages (Soehl and Yahirun 2011). This will lead us back to the old issue of the selection of individuals into mixed marriages with an extended perspective. We also believe that research should proceed to conduct a comparison of pathways to partnership and the levels and timing of various partnership transitions (from single to cohabiting or married; from cohabiting to married or separated) rather than marriage only among immigrants and their descendants; this will provide another valuable piece of information on the integration of immigrants and their descendants in European societies.

Second, it is important to conduct much more research on family trajectories among the *descendants of immigrants*, whose share has significantly increased in the last decade (de Valk and Milewski 2011). While the 'forces' of origin, destination and 'in-between' interact in shaping immigrant family and fertility patterns, it is critical to understand what happens to the descendants of immigrants in the European context. How much does their success or failure reflect the migration context of their parents ('labour migrants'), and how much it is influenced by the institutional and policy settings of various European countries? Research shows that the fate of the 'second generation' has been not as rosy as we may wish: Their educational qualifications often remain below those of the majority population and their labour market performance is often poor (Fassmann 1997; Alba 2005; Meurs et al. 2006; Aparicio 2007; Brinbaum and Cebolla-Boado 2007; Fibbi et al. 2007; Van Niekerk 2007; Kristen et al. 2008; Aeberhardt et al. 2010). Recent studies show that family patterns of the descendants of immigrants also have a distinct character, with some ethnic groups displaying high fertility and large families, e.g., Bangladeshi and Pakistani individuals in the UK, people of Turkish descent in Germany or those of North African origin in France. Most researchers attribute their high fertility to cultural factors and religion, arguing that large families continue to be a norm among some ethnic populations (Penn and Lambert 2002; Milewski

2010; Hampshire et al. 2012); alternatively, early childbearing and high fertility among the 'second generation' may be the consequence of their poor education and labour market prospects, reinforced by government policies (e.g., the 'motherhood' track in Germany and Austria) or the lack thereof (e.g., no policies to reduce high ethnic residential segregation in the UK). A major issue in this area is the potential bias in the results because of a short observation window when studying the family trajectories of the second generation due to their young age profile. Longitudinal studies recently launched in many European countries offer new opportunities for researching family dynamics among the second generation.

We also believe that the integration of research across ethnicity and that across immigrant generations would offer another fruitful avenue to proceed. While the former approach dominates in the British demographic and social science discourse, the latter is more important on continental Europe particularly in Central and Northern Europe. Research across ethnic lines emphasises the importance of group identity and related factors; however, by merging immigrants and their descendants it often downplays the factors related to immigration and non-migration; also information on group belonging usually comes from self-declared ethnicity rather than from various measures of ethnicity; the descendants of immigrants who for example do not identify themselves with a particular minority group are automatically assigned to the 'majority' population. Research across immigrant generations explicitly distinguishes between immigrants and their descendants (the 'second' generation) and includes all descendants of immigrants (usually from the 'second generation') in the analysis independent of their self-declared ethnicity; however, the approach would certainly benefit from the information on the group belonging for the descendants of immigrants either self-declared or perceived by 'significant others'. We argue that it is important to integrate these two research streams. New large-scale longitudinal studies in several European countries remove the data-related issues which to date have been seen as the main obstacles.

Third, *alternative modes of family behaviour* need to be considered and explicitly included in our analyses: first, to avoid a bias in the results, and second, to improve our understanding of ethnic minority integration. Regarding the former issue, the practice of cohabitation and bringing spouses from the country of origin must be highlighted. For example, recent studies by Cortina et al. (2008, 2010) showed that cohabitation with a native Spanish partner is a common practice among Latin American female immigrants in Spain, and is associated with lower rather than higher educational levels. At the same time, the analyses of intermarriage between native Spaniards and immigrants show that the chances of exogamy are higher for women and educated individuals, and lower for Latin-Americans (Sánchez-Dominguez et al. 2011). It is likely that the positive effect of education on mixed marriages is due to the omission of cohabitant couples from the analyses. Similarly, merging together endogamous couples formed by two immigrant partners residing in the host country and endogamous couples formed between one immigrant and one marriage migrant, we risk making mistakes and distort the proper interpretation of changing family forms and integration over time and across generations. It is also important to emphasise that the study of various family forms will improve our understanding of the levels of immigrant and ethnic minority cultural and economic

integration. For example, studies have shown that the spread of cohabitation is often a good indicator of whether and how immigrants (who often come from countries with traditional values and norms) and their descendants adapt to ongoing value changes in European countries (Rahnu 2010). Although cohabitation may sometimes be driven by economic rather than cultural factors, as studies among immigrants in Spain have shown, the influences of 'significant others'—families and peers—should also not be underestimated.

Fourth, we should promote much more *comparative research* on family trajectories among immigrants and ethnic minorities both across groups and across countries, as some of the discussed studies suggest. Previous research on migrant families has examined migrants and ethnic minorities primarily in one or at a maximum, two countries (Kalmijn et al. 2005; Dribe and Lundh 2012); we lack truly comparative research on migrant and ethnic minority families in Europe, which would consider various institutional and policy contexts. By exploiting the unique opportunity Europe offers, we can examine how socio-economic, institutional and policy settings shape family lives of immigrants and their descendants (Neyer and Andersson 2008). Studies by Milewski (2011) and Huschek et al. (2010, 2012) on fertility and union formation of the women with Turkish origin in seven European countries are a good start; these studies also provide a good example of how to pool data from different countries and conduct a descent comparative study. We argue that it is important to go further, and carefully specify and test the hypotheses on the effects of welfare state context or even more, develop 'middle range theories' on how institutional and policy settings shape family lives of immigrants and their descendants (cf. Neyer and Andersson 2008). The measurement of the cultural and structural integration of immigrants and their descendants is an important task, but becomes meaningful only if we set it in a wider welfare state context.

Let us provide a hypothetical example of how this might work in practice. We have learned from the review of previous research that the descendants of immigrants from non-Western countries have relatively high fertility levels. Assume that the analysis of the life paths of women of origin P in country B shows a pattern as follows: a woman will leave school at early age and will become unemployed; during the unemployment spell she will become pregnant and a first child is born. When the child is three years old, she will receive a short-term job; thereafter, she will again become unemployed and may even give up looking for a job. A second and a third child are born. What conclusions should we draw from such results? Early and high fertility of women of origin P may be an outcome of their poor education and labour market prospects (rather than cultural and normative factors). As a result they may decide to choose a 'motherhood track' to find a meaning for their lives and justify their lives for others. The reason for their poor education and labour market prospects is high residential segregation of ethnic minority populations in country B. Although the educational system in country B is egalitarian (non-selective schools dominate), the schools in ethnic minority areas are often poor and leave most students little chance to pursue further studies.

Assume that we will compare the case of women of origin P in country B to that of women of origin T in country G, a comparable group. For a typical woman of origin T in country G, the life course patterns may be even simpler that those for

origin P in country B; a woman will leave the type of school H at age 17–18 (H is a track of the selective school system in country G; a bottom third of the cohort normally ends up in this track). Having left school, she will soon become pregnant and a first child is born; after some time, a second and a third child are born (for some cases also a fourth child). For all this period the woman will be out of the labour market (i.e., not looking for a job). This model is much promoted by family policies in country G; until recently, the aim was to encourage women to stay at home until children started going to school, which is at age six. Many women, particularly those with poor labour market prospects, have chosen the 'motherhood' track and the descendants of immigrants are over-represented among them. Although ethnic residential segregation is low in country G, the selective school system (where selection takes place at very early age) leads to the outcome where most children of ethnic minority background find themselves together in the weakest schools.

Assume that there is country I where we find no comparable migrant group with high fertility levels. The typical pattern for a woman of the second generation may be as follows: she will leave school at age 18; she will try to establish herself at the labour market; after having been some time in full time employment she will become pregnant and a first child is born. She will take maternity leave and within 2 years a second child is born. After some time, she will take up a part-time job. This pattern is supported, first, by low educational and residential segregation between population subgroups and, second, by welfare state policies geared towards families with the aim of supporting the compatibility of employment and parenthood. If our 'ideal type analysis' was true we would thus expect high residential segregation (B), selective school systems and family policies that encourage women to stay at home (G) to promote early and high fertility among ethnic minorities. A low educational segregation between population subgroups, state policies that encourage women's employment and support the compatibility of employment and parenthood, in turn, may explain the lack of high fertility ethnic groups in country I. Clearly, family and fertility patterns of ethnic minority families are an indicator of their wider social, economic and cultural integration and well-being.

To conclude, we would like to draw attention to some methodological challenges and opportunities. The analysis of life events among immigrants and their descendants is increasingly conducted by regression techniques based on the life table analysis (Hoem 1993). However, the shift from the 'one life-event-at-a-time' approach to the analysis of life histories will require some re-consideration of analytical methods used in the study of immigrant and ethnic minority families (see also de Valk et al. 2011). The technique of sequence analysis is one way of describing an evolution of interrelated life domains (Abbott 1995) and has been applied in demographic research to study family patterns and dynamics. Another and perhaps a more fruitful way of analysing life trajectories of immigrants and their descendants are to do this by the means of multistate modelling. Although multistate models have been used in demographic and social research for long time, they have been applied to mostly investigate discrete life events of two life domains (e.g., a single (rural) woman faces a choice between marriage and migration).

Multistate models can be extended and developed to study life trajectories of individuals, the timing and sequence of events; the models allow also for the standardisation for various factors and can be further developed to detect and control for unobserved selection effects into various statuses (Kulu and Steele 2013).

While we have briefly discussed the methods for the analysis of quantitative longitudinal data and advocated the techniques of multistate modelling, the analysis of qualitative longitudinal data offers another way of improving our understanding of the factors shaping family dynamics among immigrants and their descendants. Some good examples can be found from the recent literature (Hampshire et al. 2012).

Acknowledgments The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013) under Grant Agreement no. 320116 for the research project FamiliesAndSocieties.We are also grateful for Frances Goldscheider, Allan Puur, Gunnar Andersson and two anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions on a previous version of this article.

References

Abbott, A. (1995). Sequence analysis: New methods for old ideas. *Annual Review of Sociology,21*, 93–113.

Adsera, A., & Chiswick, B. R. (2007). Are there gender and country of origin differences in immigrant labor market outcomes across European destinations? *Journal of Population Economics,20*(3), 495–526.

Aeberhardt, R., Fougere, D., Pouget, J., & Rathelot, R. (2010). Wages and employment of French workers with African origin. *Journal of Population Economics,23*(3), 881–905.

Alba, R. (2005). Bright vs. blurred boundaries: Second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,28*(1), 20–49.

Alba, R. D., & Golden, R. M. (1986). Patterns of ethnic marriage in the United-States. *Social Forces,65*(1), 202–223.

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review,31*(4), 826–874.

Andersson, G. (2004). Childbearing after migration: Fertility patterns of foreign-born women in Sweden. *International Migration Review,38*(2), 747–774.

Andersson, G., & Scott, K. (2005). Labour-market status and first-time parenthood: The experience of immigrant women in Sweden, 1981–97. *Population Studies,59*(1), 21–38.

Andersson, G., & Scott, K. (2007). Childbearing dynamics of couples in a universalistic welfare state: The role of labor-market status, country of origin, and gender. *Demographic Research,17*, 897–938.

Andersson, G., and Scott, K. (2010). *Divorce risks of immigrants in Sweden*. In Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Population Association of America, Dallas: Population Association of America.

Aparicio, R. (2007). The integration of the second and 1.5 generations of Moroccan, Dominican and Peruvian origin in Madrid and Barcelona. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,33*(7), 1169–1193.

Arbaci, S. (2008). (Re)viewing ethnic residential segregation in Southern European cities: Housing and urban regimes as mechanisms of marginalisation. *Housing Studies,23*(4), 589–613.

Bagley, C. (1972). Patterns of inter-ethnic marriage in Great Britain. *Phylon,33*(4), 373–379.

Baizán, P., Beauchemin, C., & González-Ferrer, A. (2014). An origin and destination perspective on family reunification: The case of Senegalese couples. *European Journal of Population,30*(1), 65–87.

Baker, M., & Benjamin, D. (1997). The role of the family in immigrants' labor-market activity: An evaluation of alternative explanations. *American Economic Review,87*(4), 705–727.

Bauböck, R. (2003). Towards a political theory of migrant transnationalism. *International Migration Review,37*(3), 700–723.
Becker, G. S., Landes, E. M., & Michael, R. T. (1977). An economic analysis of marital instability. *Journal of Political Economy,85*(6), 1141–1187.
Bernhardt, E., Goldscheider, F., & Goldscheider, C. (2007a). Integrating the second generation: Gender and family attitudes in early adulthood in Sweden (Die zweite Generation integrieren: Geschlechtsrollen- und Familienvorstellungen im frühen Erwachsenenalter in Schweden). *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung,1*, 55–70.
Bernhardt, E., Goldscheider, C., Goldscheider, F., & Bjerén, G. (2007b). *Immigration, gender, and family transitions to adulthood in Sweden*. Lanham: University Press of America.
Berrington, A. (1994). Marriage and family formation among the white and ethnic minority populations in Britain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,17*(3), 517–546.
Berry, J. W. (1992). Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. *International Migration,30*, 69–85.
Bos, V., Kunst, A. E., Garssen, J., & Mackenbach, J. P. (2007). Duration of residence was not consistently related to immigrant mortality. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology,60*(6), 585–592.
Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brinbaum, Y., & Cebolla-Boado, H. (2007). The school careers of ethnic minority youth in France: Success or disillusion? *Ethnicities,7*(3), 445–474.
Bumpass, L. L., & Sweet, J. A. (1972). Differentials in marital instability: 1970. *American Sociological Review,37*(6), 754–766.
Burchinal, L. B., & Chancellor, L. E. (1963). Survival rates among religiously homogamous and interreligious marriages. *Social Forces,41*(4), 353–362.
Carol, S., Ersanilli, E., Wagner, M. (2014). Spousal choice among the children of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in six European countries: Transnational spouse or co-ethnic migrant? *International Migration Review* (published online).
Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (2009). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world* (4th ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
Castro Martin, T., & Rosero-Bixby, L. (2011). Motherhood and transnational borders: Immigrants' women fertility in Spain. *Revista Internacional De Sociologia,69*, 105–137.
Coleman, D. (1994). Trends in fertility and intermarriage among immigrant populations in Western Europe as measures of integration. *Journal of Biosocial Science,26*(1), 107–136.
Coleman, D. A., & Dubuc, S. (2010). The fertility of ethnic minorities in the UK, 1960s–2006. *Population Studies,64*(1), 19–41.
Cortina, C., Esteve, A., & Domingo, A. (2008). Marriage patterns of the foreign-born population in a new country of immigration: The case of Spain. *International Migration Review,42*(4), 877–902.
Cortina, C., Garcia, X. B., & Castro-Martin, T. (2010). Imported family models? Cohabitation patterns of Latin American women in Spain (¿Modelos familiares de aquí o de allá? Pautas de cohabitación entre las mujeres Lationoamericanas en España). *América Latina Hoy,55*, 61–84.
De Valk, H. A. G., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2007). Timing preferences for women's family-life transitions: Intergenerational transmission among migrants and Dutch. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *69*, 190–206.
De Valk, H. A. G., & Medrano, J. D. (2014). Guest editorial on meeting and mating across borders: Union formation in the European Union single market. *Population, Space and Place,20*(2), 103–109.
De Valk, H. A. G., & Milewski, N. (2011). Family life transitions among children of immigrants: An introduction. *Advances in Life Course Research,16*(4), 145–151.
De Valk, H. A. G., Windzio, M., Wingens, M., & Aybek, C. (2011). Immigrant settlement and the life course: An exchange of research perspectives and outlook for the future. In M. Wingens, M. Windzio, H. A. G. de Valk, & C. Aybek (Eds.), *A life-course perspective on migration and integration* (pp. 283–297). Dordrecht: Springer.
Dinkel, R. H., & Lebok, U. H. (1997). The fertility of migrants before and after crossing the border: The ethnic German population from the former Soviet Union as a case study. *International Migration,35*(2), 253–270.
Dribe, M., & Lundh, C. (2011). Cultural dissimilarity and intermarriage. A longitudinal study of immigrants in Sweden 1990–2005. *International Migration Review,45*(2), 297–324.
Dribe, M., & Lundh, C. (2012). Intermarriage, value context and union dissolution: Sweden 1990–2005. *European Journal of Population,28*(2), 139–158.

Eeckhaut, M. C. W., Lievens, J., van de Putte, B., & Lusyne, P. (2011). Partner selection and divorce in ethnic minorities: Distinguishing between two types of ethnic homogamous marriages. *International Migration Review,45*(2), 269–296.

Elder, G. H. J. (1994). Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly,57*(1), 4–15.

Fassmann, H. (1997). Is the Austrian labour market ethnically segmented? *European Journal of Population,13*(1), 17–32.

Feng, Z., Boyle, P., van Ham, M., & Raab, G. M. (2010). Neighbourhood ethnic mix and the formation of mixed ethnic unions in Britain. In J. Stillwell & M. van Ham (Eds.), *Ethnicity and integration, understanding population trend and processes 3* (pp. 83–104). Heidelberg: Springer.

Feng, Z., Boyle, P., van Ham, M., & Raab, G. M. (2012). Are mixed-ethnic unions more likely to dissolve than co-ethnic unions? New evidence from Britain. *European Journal of Population,28*(2), 159–176.

Fibbi, R., Lerch, M., & Wanner, P. (2007). Naturalisation and socio-economic characteristics of youth of immigrant descent in Switzerland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,33*(7), 1121–1144.

Finney, N., & Catney, G. (2012). *Minority internal migration in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Foner, N., & Alba, R. (2008). Immigrant religion in the US and Western Europe: Bridge or barrier to inclusion? *International Migration Review,42*(2), 360–392.

Garssen, J., & Nicolaas, H. (2008). Fertility of Turkish and Moroccan women in the Netherlands: Adjustment to native level within one generation. *Demographic Research,19*, 1249–1280.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Glick Schiller, N. (2009). *A global perspective on transnational migration: Theorising migration without methodological nationalism.* In Working Paper No. 67. Oxford: University of Oxford, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.

Goldscheider, F., Goldscheider, C., & Bernhardt, E. M. (2011). Creating egalitarian families among the adult children of Turkish- and Polish-origin immigrants in Sweden. *International Migration Review,45*(1), 68–88.

González-Ferrer, A. (2006a). *Family and labor strategies in migration. Family reunification, partner choice and female labor participation in the host country.* Juan March Institute, Unpublished PhD thesis.

González-Ferrer, A. (2006b). Who do immigrants marry? Partner choice among single immigrants in Germany. *European Sociological Review,22*(2), 171–185.

González-Ferrer, A. (2011). Explaining the labour performance of immigrant women in Spain: The interplay between family, migration and legal trajectories. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology,52*(1–2), 63–78.

Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gungor, D., Fleischmann, F., & Phalet, K. (2011). Religious identification, beliefs, and practices among Turkish Belgian and Moroccan Belgian Muslims: Intergenerational continuity and acculturative change. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,42*(8), 1356–1374.

Haandrikman, K. (2014). Binational marriages in Sweden: Is there an EU effect? *Population, Space and Place,20*(2), 177–199.

Hamel, C., Lhommeau, B., Pailhé, A., & Santelli, E. (2013). *Rencontrer son conjoint dans un espace multicultural et international*. Documents de Travail 189. Paris: INED. Available at: http://www.ined.fr/fichier/t_publication/1624/publi_pdf1_document_travail_2013_189_rencontre_conjoint.pdf.

Hamel, C., & Pailhé, A. (2011). *Former une famille en contexte migratoire*. Documents de Travail 181. Paris: INED. Available at: http://www.ined.fr/fichier/t_publication/1607/publi_pdf1_181.pdf.

Hampshire, K., Blell, M., & Simpson, B. (2012). Navigating new socio-demographic landscapes: Using anthropological demography to understand the 'Persistence' of high and early fertility among British Pakistanis. *European Journal of Population,28*(1), 39–63.

Hannemann, T. (2012). *It breaks a man's heart: Socioeconomic differences in the onset of cardiovascular disease in contemporary Sweden*. Lund University: Lund. Lund Studies in Economic History 58.

Hartung, A., Vandezande, V., Phalet, K., & Swyngedouw, M. (2011). Partnership preferences of the Belgian second generation: Who lives with whom? *Advances in Life Course Research,16*(4), 152–163.

Hervitz, H. M. (1985). Selectivity, adaptation, or disruption? A comparison of alternative hypotheses on the effects of migration on fertility: The case of Brazil. *International Migration Review,19*(2), 293–317.

Hoem, J. M. (1975). *Fertility and out-migration: Reflections on research approaches in empirical investigations of the association between two demographic phenomena*. In Working Paper 1. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Laboratory of Actuarial Mathematics.

Hoem, J. M. (1993). *Classical demographic models of analysis and modern event-history techniques*. IUSSP: 22nd International Population Conference. Montreal, Canada,*3*, 281–291.

Holland, J. A., & de Valk, H. A. G. (2013). Ideal ages for family formation among immigrants in Europe. *Advances in Life Course Research,18*(4), 257–269.

Howard, M. M. (2005). Variation in dual citizenship policies in the countries of the EU. *International Migration Review,39*(3), 697–720.

Huschek, D., de Valk, H. A. G., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2012). Partner choice patterns among the descendants of Turkish immigrants in Europe. *European Journal of Population,28*(3), 241–268.

Huschek, D., Liefbroer, A. C., & de Valk, H. A. G. (2010). Timing of first union among second-generation Turks in Europe: The role of parents, peers and institutional context. *Demographic Research,22*(16), 473–504.

Kalmijn, M. (1998). Intermarriage and homogamy: Causes, patterns, trends. *Annual Review of Sociology,24*, 395–421.

Kalmijn, M., de Graaf, P. M., & Janssen, J. P. G. (2005). Intermarriage and the risk of divorce in the Netherlands: The effects of differences in religion and in nationality, 1974–94. *Population Studies,59*(1), 71–85.

Kalmijn, M., & van Tubergen, F. (2006). Ethnic intermarriage in the Netherlands: Confirmations and refutations of accepted insights. *European Journal of Population,22*(4), 371–397.

Kane, T. T., & Stephen, E. H. (1988). Patterns of intermarriage of guestworker populations in the Federal Republic of Germany: 1960–1985. *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft,14*, 187–204.

Katus, K., Puur, A., & Põldma, A. (2002a). *Cohort population development in Estonia (Eesti põlvkondlik rahvastikuareng)*. Tallinn: Estonian Interuniversity Population Research Centre.

Katus, K., Puur, A., & Sakkeus, L. (2002b). Immigrant population in Estonia. In W. Haug, P. Compton, & Y. Courbage (Eds.), *The demographic characteristics of immigrant population in Europe* (pp. 131–192). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Klein, T. (2001). Intermarriages between Germans and foreigners in Germany. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,32*(3), 325–346.

Klesment, K. (2010). *Comparison between native and immigrant population in Estonia regarding the effect of education on second births*. In Paper presented at the European Population Conference, Vienna: Vienna Institute of Demography.

Kogan, I. (2007). A study of immigrants' employment careers in West Germany using the sequence analysis technique. *Social Science Research,36*(2), 491–511.

Kristen, C., Reimer, D., & Kogan, I. (2008). Higher education entry of Turkish immigrant youth in Germany. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology,49*(2–3), 127–151.

Kulu, H. (2005). Migration and fertility: Competing hypotheses re-examined. *European Journal of Population,21*(1), 51–87.

Kulu, H. (2006). Fertility of internal migrants: Comparison between Austria and Poland. *Population Space and Place,12*(3), 147–170.

Kulu, H., & Milewski, N. (2007). Family change and migration in the life course: An introduction. *Demographic Research,17*, 567–590.

Kulu, H., & Steele, F. (2013). Interrelationships between childbearing and housing transitions in the family life course. *Demography*, *50*(5), 1687–1714.

Kulu, H., & Tammaru, T. (2003). Housing and ethnicity in Soviet Tartu. *Yearbook of Population Research in Finland,39*, 119–140.

Kulu, H., & Tammaru, T. (2004). Diverging views on integration in Estonia: Determinants of Estonian language skills among ethnic minorities. *Journal of Baltic Studies,35*(4), 378–401.

Landis, J. T. (1949). Marriages of mixed and non-mixed religious faith. *American Sociological Review,14*(3), 401–407.

Lanzieri, G. (2012). *Merging populations—A look at marriages with foreign-born persons in European countries*. EUROSTAT, Available at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/publication?p_product_code=KS-SF-12-029.

Lichter, D. T., Carmalt, J. H., & Qian, Z. (2011). Immigration and intermarriage among Hispanics: Crossing racial and generational boundaries. *Sociological Forum,26*(2), 241–264.

Lievens, J. (1998). Interethnic marriage: Bringing in the context through multilevel modelling. *European Journal of Population,14*, 117–155.

Logan, J. R., & Shin, H.-J. (2012). Assimilation by the third generation? Marital choices of white ethnics at the dawn of the twentieth century. *Social Science Research,41*(5), 1116–1125.
Lucassen, L., & Laarman, C. (2009). Immigration, intermarriage and the changing face of Europe in the post war period. *History of the Family,14*(1), 52–68.
Lundström, K. E., & Andersson, G. (2012). Labor market status, migrant status, and first childbearing in Sweden. *Demographic Research,27*, 719–742.
Macisco, J. J., Bouvier, L. F., & Weller, R. H. (1970). Effect of labour force participation on relation between migration status and fertility in San-Juan, Puerto-Rico. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly-Health and Society,48*(1), 51–70.
Meng, X., & Gregory, R. G. (2005). Intermarriage and the economic assimilation of immigrants. *Journal of Labor Economics,23*(1), 135–175.
Meurs, D., Pailhé, A., & Simon, P. (2006). The persistence of intergenerational inequalities linked to immigration: Labour market outcomes for immigrants and their descendants in France. *Population,61*(5–6), 763–801.
Milewski, N. (2007). First child of immigrant workers and their descendants in West Germany: Interrelation of events, disruption, or adaptation? *Demographic Research,17*, 859–895.
Milewski, N. (2010). Immigrant fertility in West Germany: Is there a socialization effect in transitions to second and third births? *European Journal of Population,26*(3), 297–323.
Milewski, N. (2011). Transition to a first birth among Turkish second-generation migrants in Western Europe. *Advances in Life Course Research,16*(4), 178–189.
Milewski, N., & Hamel, C. (2010). Union formation and partner choice in a transnational context: The case of descendants of Turkish immigrants in France. *International Migration Review,44*(3), 615–658.
Milewski, N., & Kulu, H. (2014). Mixed marriages in Germany: A high risk of divorce for immigrant-native couples. *European Journal of Population,30*(1), 89–113.
Mussino, E., & Stozza, S. (2012). Does citizenship still matter? Second birth risks of migrants from Albania, Morocco, and Romania in Italy. *European Journal of Population,28*(3), 269–302.
Mussino, E., & Strozza, S. (2012). The fertility of immigrants after arrival: The Italian case. *Demographic Research,26*, 97–130.
Musterd, S. (2005). Social and ethnic segregation in Europe: Levels, causes, and effects. *Journal of Urban Affairs,27*(3), 331–348.
Muttarak, R., & Heath, A. (2010). Who intermarries in Britain? Explaining ethnic diversity in intermarriage patterns. *The British Journal of Sociology,61*(2), 275–305.
Neyer, G., & Andersson, G. (2008). Consequences of family policies on childbearing behavior: Effects or artifacts? *Population and Development Review,34*(4), 699–724.
Okun, B. S., & Kagya, S. (2012). Fertility change among post-1989 immigrants to Israel from the former Soviet Union. *International Migration Review,46*(4), 792–827.
Pagnini, D. L., & Morgan, S. P. (1990). Intermarriage and social distance among U.S. immigrants at the turn of the century. *American Sociological Review,96*, 405–432.
Penn, R., & Lambert, P. (2002). Attitudes towards ideal family size of different ethnic/nationality groups in Great Britain, France and Germany. *Population Trends*, *108*, 49–58.
Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new 2nd-generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,530*, 74–96.
Rahnu, L. (2010). *Timing of cohabitation among native and foreign-origin women in Estonia*. In Paper presented at the European Population Conference, Vienna: Vienna Institute of Demography.
Rebhun, U. (2010). Immigration, gender, and earnings in Israel. *European Journal of Population,26*(1), 73–97.
Rendall, M. S., Tsang, F., Rubin, J. K., Rabinovich, L., & Janta, B. (2010). Contrasting trajectories of labor-market integration between migrant women in Western and Southern Europe. *European Journal of Population,26*(4), 383–410.
Safi, M. (2010). Patterns of immigrant intermarriage in France: Intergenerational marital assimilation? *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung,22*(1), 89–108.
Safi, M., & Rogers, G. (2008). Intermarriage and assimilation: Disparities in levels of exogamy among immigrants in France. *Population,63*(2), 239–267.
Sánchez-Dominguez, M., de Valk, H. A. G., & Reher, D. (2011). Marriage strategies among immigrants in Spain. *Revista Internacional de Sociología (RIS),69*(M1), 139–166.
Schoorl, J. J. (1990). Fertility adaptation of Turkish and Moroccan women in the Netherlands. *International Migration,28*(4), 477–495.

Schroedter, J. H., & Rössel, J. (2013). Europeanisation without the European Union? The case of bi-national marriages in Switzerland. *Population, Space and Place*, (published online).
Scott, K., & Stanfors, M. (2011). The transition to parenthood among the second generation: Evidence from Sweden, 1990–2005. *Advances in Life Course Research,16*(4), 190–204.
Seifert, W. (1997). Admission policy, patterns of migration and integration: The German and French case compared. *New Community,23*(4), 441–460.
Singley, S. G., & Landale, N. S. (1998). Incorporating origin and process in migration-fertility frameworks: The case of Puerto Rican women. *Social Forces,76*(4), 1437–1464.
Smith, S., Maas, I., & van Tubergen, F. (2012). Irreconcilable differences? Ethnic intermarriage and divorce in the Netherlands, 1995–2008. *Social Science Research,41*(5), 1126–1137.
Sobotka, T. (2008). The rising importance of migrants for childbearing in Europe. *Demographic Research,19*, 225–247.
Soehl, T., & Yahirun, J. (2011). Timing of union formation and partner choice in immigrant societies: The United States and Germany. *Advances in Life Course Research,16*(4), 205–216.
Sole-Auro, A., & Crimmins, E. M. (2008). Health of immigrants in European countries. *International Migration Review,42*(4), 861–876.
Song, M. (2010). What happens after segmented assimilation? An exploration of intermarriage and 'mixed race' young people in Britain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,33*(7), 1194–1213.
Toulemon, L. (2004). Fertility among immigrant women: New data, new approach. *Population and Societies,400*, 1–4.
Tzeng, M. S. (1992). The effects of socioeconomic heterogamy and changes on martial dissolution for first marriages. *Journal of Marriage and Family,54*(3), 609–619.
Van Ham, M., & Tammaru, T. (2011). Ethnic minority-majority unions in Estonia. *European Journal of Population,27*(3), 313–335.
Van Kerckem, K., van der Bracht, K., Stevens, P. A. J., & van de Putte, B. (2013). Transnational marriages on the decline: Explaining changing trends in partner choice among Turkish Belgians. *International Migration Review,47*(4), 1006–1038.
Van Niekerk, M. (2007). Second-generation Caribbeans in the Netherlands: Different migration histories, diverging trajectories. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,33*(7), 1063–1081.
Van Tubergen, F., & Maas, I. (2007). Ethnic intermarriage among immigrants in the Netherlands: An analysis of population data. *Social Science Research,36*(3), 1065–1086.
Vertovec, S. (2004). Migrant transnationalism and modes of transformation. *International Migration Review,38*(3), 970–1001.
Voas, D. (1998). The maintenance and transformation of ethnicity: Evidence on mixed partnerships in Britain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,35*(9), 1497–1513.
Wengler, A. (2011). The health status of first- and second-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany. *International Journal of Public Health,56*(5), 493–501.
Wilson, B. (2013). *Disentangling the quantum and tempo of immigrant fertility*. In Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Population Geographies, Groningen: University of Groningen.
Zhang, Y., & Van Hook, J. (2009). Marital dissolution among interracial couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family,71*(1), 95–107.